

Appl. No.: 10/578,990
Amdt. Dated April 19, 2010
Reply to Office Action mailed January 25, 2010

REMARKS:

Please cancel claims 53-70, which were withdrawn from consideration in an election requirement.

Claims 1-37 were previously canceled in a preliminary amendment.

Claims 53-70 have now been canceled without prejudice to the filing of Divisional Applications.

Claims 38-52 are pending in the application.

The Office objected to claim 52 for informalities relating to its phrasing. The last phrase of Claim 52 has been amended now in accordance with the recommendation of the Examiner to read:

“...whereupon the interengagement transfer elements transfer the setting force to the second slip, setting the first and second slips simultaneously.”

Applicants believe that claim 52, as amended, is now corrected, and therefore Applicants respectfully request that this Objection be withdrawn.

The Office rejected claims 38-34 and 52, - however the Applicants believe that it was intended that the rejection be for claims 38-43 and 52 - as being rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 1,795,578 (Smith), and will therefore respond accordingly.

Appl. No.: 10/578,990
Amdt. Dated April 19, 2010
Reply to Office Action mailed January 25, 2010

The Examiner detailed a number of similar elements between the present application as filed and the Smith reference US 1,795,578. However, Independent claims 38 and 52 have been amended now to claim additional elements disclosed in the present invention, but which Applicants believe are not shown or described in any of Smith, US 1,795,578; Mosing (US 7,032,678) and/or Brown (US 3,197,835) or any other of the cited references. The new limitations now include:

“... a door engaging with a latch, the door operated by a hydraulic piston and cylinder, the piston and cylinder having a signal port...”

and,

“... a pilot line and a valve for selectively directing flow of a hydraulic fluid to the signal port to activate the slip actuator to disengage the slips, thereby allowing the slips to be disengaged while the door and latch remain engaged...”

Applicants believe these new limitations render independent claim 38 now allowable under 35 USC 102(b) over US 1,795,578 (Smith). It is clear that Smith did not anticipate the structure of amended independent claim 1, of the present invention. Smith does not appear to show or describe the newly claimed structure of a door engaging with a latch, the door operated by a hydraulic piston and cylinder, the piston and cylinder having a signal port in addition to a pilot line and a valve for selectively directing flow of a hydraulic fluid to the signal port to activate the slip actuator to disengage the slips, thereby allowing the slips to be disengaged while the door and latch remain engaged, as now claimed.

As a result, Applicants believe that claim 1, as amended, is now allowable over US 1,795,578 (Smith), and therefore respectfully request its allowance.

Appl. No.: 10/578,990
Amdt. Dated April 19, 2010
Reply to Office Action mailed January 25, 2010

Since dependent claims 39-51 all depend from now allowable claim 38, Applicants believe that claims 39-51 are now also allowable over US 1,795,578 (Smith).

Applicants further believe that amended pending independent claim 52, now re-written with limitations similar to those presented in the amendment to claim 38, as described above, now render claim 52 allowable over Smith (US 1,795,578) as well.

The new claim elements added to pending amended independent claims 38 and 52 are fully disclosed and described in detail in the specification of the present invention.

Since dependent claims 39-51 all depend from now allowable claim 38, Applicants believe that these claims are now also allowable, and therefore respectfully request that they also be allowed.

The Office rejected claims 46-49 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 1,795,578 in view of US 7,032,678. For reasons similar to those listed above, Applicants believe that independent claim 1, as amended, is now allowable over the cited references. Since dependent claims 46-49 depend now from independent claim 1, Applicants believe that these claims are now novel and allowable over US 1,795,578 in view of US 7,032,678.

The Office rejected claim 50 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 1,795,578. Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's Official Notice that this claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited references. However, Applicants believe that the amendments to claim 1, the amended base claim from which claim 50 depends, have now rendered claim 1 allowable over US 1,795,578 as well.

Applicants, therefore respectfully request that, for the reasons detailed above, since claim 50, depending from now allowable claim 38, now also be found allowable.

Appl. No.: 10/578,990
Amdt. Dated April 19, 2010
Reply to Office Action mailed January 25, 2010

Finally, claim 51 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 1,795,579 in view of US 3,197,835. As previously explained, Applicants believe that base claim 38, as amended, is now allowable over all the above cited references. As a result, Applicants believe that claim 51 is therefore also allowable, and therefore respectfully request its allowance as well.

All of pending claims claims now being allowable, Applicants respectfully request that a timely notice of allowance be forthcoming in this case.

It is believed that there are no fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required at any time during the prosecution of this application without specific authorization, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 50-0786. If there are any questions concerning the above, please contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4084.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffery E. Daly/

Electronically signed by Jeffery E. Daly on April 19, 2010.

Reg. No. 44,640

Ph: (713) 934-4084
e-mail: Jdaly@wmalaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 or by facsimile or electronic transmission to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

4/19/10
Date

/Jeffery E. Daly/
Electronic Signature